

REMARKS

Claims 13-29 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1-12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein and new Claims 13-29 have been added. The basis for these new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the Specification at page 6, line 2 to correct a typographical error. Specifically, Applicant has replaced the term "component" with the term "components." No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot as Claim 7 is has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated

by Manor (U.S. Patent No. 3,980,152).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot as Claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manor (US 3,980,150).

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manor in view of Bosley et al. (US 6,070,404).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot as Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

The Examiner, in rejecting now-canceled independent Claims 1 and 5, relied primarily on Manor (U.S. Patent No. 3,980,152). The Examiner admits that Manor fails to teach generating electricity caused by movement of a fluid through a device. See the Office Action mailed March 15, 2006, at page 3. However, the Examiner, in rejecting now-

canceled Claims 3 and 7, relied on a combination of Manor and Bosley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,404) as teaching a system that generates electricity through use of a compressor/generator arrangement.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the teachings of Manor with Bosley. Manor is directed to an air-powered vehicle having an air-powered reciprocating piston engine. Bosley is directed to a gaseous fuel compression and control system for use in generating electricity by harnessing energy associated with natural gas moving through a natural-gas pipeline. There is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to provide the air-powered vehicle of Manor with a system used to harness energy from a natural-gas pipeline such as the system disclosed by Bosley.

Assuming arguendo that the combination of Manor with Bosley is proper, Applicant respectfully submits that such a combination fails to teach or suggest the elements of the claimed invention. Manor fails to teach or suggest a device disposed between a pressurized tank and a drive member of a vehicle that generates electricity caused by fluid moving from the pressurized tank to the drive member in a first mode. Manor also fails to teach or suggest that such a device also compresses fluid from the first tank to a predetermined pressure prior to the fluid reaching the drive member if the fluid disposed within the first tank falls below the predetermined pressure in a second mode.

Manor is directed to an air-powered vehicle having an air-powered, reciprocating-piston engine. See Manor at Col. 1, lines 17-25. Manor teaches a compressor (144) and an alternator (160) driven by an air-propelled compressor (142), a motor (156), or a starter motor (162). See Manor at Col. 9, Ins. 10-29 and Figure 4. The compressor (144) and alternator (160) are *separate* devices and are driven either by another compressor (142)

or a pair of motors (156, 162). See Manor at Col. 9, Ins. 10-29. Neither device is driven by fluid moving from a tank (166, 168) to a drive member of the air-powered vehicle.

Bosley similarly fails to teach or suggest a device disposed between a pressurized tank and a drive member of a vehicle that generates electricity caused by fluid moving from the pressurized tank to the drive member in a first mode or that compresses fluid from the first tank to a predetermined pressure prior to the fluid reaching the drive member if the fluid disposed within the first tank falls below the predetermined pressure in a second mode. Bosley is directed to a gaseous fuel compression and control system for use in generating electricity by harnessing energy associated with natural gas moving through a natural-gas pipeline. See Bosley at Col. 5, lines 60-63. The compression and control system includes a turbo generator (12) having a compressor (14) connected with a generator, whereby the compressor may be run as an expander for the purpose of dropping fuel pressure. See Bosley at Col. 5, Ins. 51-59. Bosley, while teaching a single device that compresses or expands gaseous fuels, fails to teach or suggest use of such a device with a vehicle, much less a device disposed between a pressurized tank and a drive member of a vehicle that generates electricity in a first mode and compresses the fluid from the pressurized tank if the pressure of the fluid disposed within the tank falls below a predetermined pressure.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 13, 20, and 25, as well as Claims 14-19, 21-24, and 26-29, respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/15/06

By:



Matthew H. Szalach, Reg. No. 53,665
(248) 944-6526

Attorney for Applicant

Ralph E. Smith
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC.
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519